

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/552,552 | DE BLOCK, MARC | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | VINOD KUMAR | 1638 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowance

(1) VINOD KUMAR.

(3) Alexander Spiegler.

(2) Robert Schulman.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 March 2010

Time: 10:00

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

16

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Applicant authorized amendment to claim 16 to overcome potential issues under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Vinod Kumar/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)